



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,127	07/25/2005	Caiguo Gong	2002B094	6723

23455 7590 09/30/2009  
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY  
5200 BAYWAY DRIVE  
P.O. BOX 2149  
BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149

EXAMINER
----------

PEPITONE, MICHAEL F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/30/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte*: CAIGUO GONG, ANTHONY JAY DIAS, ANDY HAISHUNG TSOU,  
BEVERLY JEAN POOLE and KRISS RANDALL KARP

---

Application 10/518,127  
Technology Center 1700

---

Mailed: September 29, 2009

---

Before DEBORAH L. PERRY, *Supervisory Paralegal Specialist Review Team*.

**ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER**

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on September 9, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

GROUND'S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A review of the file reveals that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed June 4, 2009, under the heading "Grounds of rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" is either unclear or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the last Office action of record. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Furthermore, the examiner must provide a clear statement of whether examiner agrees or disagrees with the statement of grounds of rejection to be reviewed as set forth in the brief and an explanation of any disagreement. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8<sup>th</sup> ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

Specifically, the Examiner's Answer, under the heading GROUND'S OF REJECTION omits Claims 1-3 5, 9-11 14, 16, 19, 20, 22-23, 29-32, 36-38, 40, 42, 45 and 73-74 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5-6 8, 10-11, 13, 16, 19-20, 22-23, 29-30, 32, 24-37, 39, 42, 45 of copending Application No. 10/518,193; whereas the Final Rejection, mailed September 15, 2008, included the double patent rejection of Claims 1-3 5, 9-11 14, 16, 19, 20, 22-23, 29-32, 36-38, 40, 42, 45 and 73-74. Also, the

Advisory Action dated November 25, 2008, pg. 4 states “The nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting of claims 1-3, 5-6 8, 10-11, 13, 16, 19-20, 22-23, 29-30, 32, 24-37, 39, 42, 45 of copending Application No. 10/518,193 is maintained. The examiner must provide clarification as to the disposition of claims 1-3, 5-6 8, 10-11, 13, 16, 19-20, 22-23, 29-30, 32, 24-37, 39, 42, 45.

Clarification of the record is required for all Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal for all claims.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly,  
it is ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to vacate the Examiner’s Answer mailed June 4, 2009;
- 2) to issue a PTOL-90 clarifying the status of double patenting rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-6 8, 10-11, 13, 16, 19-20, 22-23, 29-30, 32, 24-37, 39, 42, 45

OR

- 3) to issue a new Examiner’s Answer setting forth the correct Grounds of rejection and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;
- 4) to include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee (as required for any new grounds of rejection); and,
- 5) such further action as may be required.

Application 10/518,127

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

DP/dw

EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY  
5200 BOYWAY DRIVE  
P.O. BOX 2149  
BAYTOWN TX 77522-2149